

S.N. 09/847,198

RD-28698-2

REMARKS

The Office action dated May 7, 2004 and the cited references have been carefully considered.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6-12, and 14-18 are pending.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, and 16 are allowed.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (U.S. Patent 5,801,483; hereinafter "Watanabe") in view of Chvatal (U.S. Patent 3,755,065). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Chvatal. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims because a combination of Watanabe and Chvatal does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of these claims.

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." MPEP § 2143.03 (8th ed., Rev. 1, Feb. 2003).

Watanabe merely discloses a low-pressure mercury vapor discharge lamp. The Examiner even admitted that Watanabe is silent regarding a sealing composition comprising a silver compound, a gold compound, or combinations thereof, as is recited in each of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, and 18.

Chvatal teaches a binary oxidic sealing composition of silver (I) oxide and vanadium pentoxide. Chvatal does not teach or suggest any silver compound other than silver (I)

S.N. 09/847,198

RD-28698-2

oxide. Therefore, a combination of Watanabe and Chvatal does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of amended claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 14, 15, 17, and 18.

Regarding claims 1 and 10, Chvatal teaches only a binary oxidic sealing composition of silver (I) oxide and vanadium pentoxide, but does not teach or suggest any embodiment that has silver (I) oxide alone. Therefore, Chvatal does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of claims 1 and 10.

Since a combination of Watanabe and Chvatal does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, and 18, these claims are patentable over Watanabe in view of Chvatal under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested. Allowance of claims at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Toan P. Vo, Ph.D.
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No. 43,225
(518)387-6648

Schenectady, New York
June 5, 2004